REMARKS

Applicants maintain and incorporate by reference herein those arguments previously advanced on pages 1 through 6 of Response C, filed February 17, 2003. Applicants also again respectfully traverse the outstanding Office Action as being not fully responsive, for the reasons discussed in Response C. Applicants therefore again respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the previous arguments in full, and withdraw the outstanding Section 103 rejections. Additionally, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the following new arguments and expansions upon the previous arguments, in light of the amendments included in this Amendment.

Claim 1 still stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA") in view of Walton et al. (U.S. 6,201,588) and Lien (U.S. 5,907,380). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons of record, and as follows. None of the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest first and second projections provided on first and second electrodes respectively, and that the first and second electrodes are of an opaque metal provided outside a display area in which optical beam transmission is turned on and off, as in claims 1 and 6 of the present invention, as amended.

As previously discussed, only Lien has been cited by the Examiner for teaching projections on electrodes. But, as pointed out to the Examiner repeatedly, Lien fails to teach or suggest two different projections are formed on two different respective electrodes.

Moreover, the Examiner has not provided any support from the prior art references for teaching these features of the present invention, nor has the Examiner otherwise answered these arguments by Applicants in any way. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the Section 103 rejections of claim 1 should be immediately withdrawn.

Additionally, claim 1 of the present invention has been amended to further clarify that the metal electrodes on which the projections are provided are opaque, and located outside the display area in which transmission of an optical beam is turned on and off. Lien, on the other hand, specifically shows projections provided within the display area in which optical beam transmission is turned on and off. Accordingly, because only Lien of the three cited references, even teaches any projections, and because Lien does not teach these additional features of the present invention, the Section 103 rejection of claim 1 of the present invention is further respectfully traversed.

Furthermore, the features of the present invention discussed above provide significant advantages over the configuration taught by Lien. Applicants submit that Lien's liquid crystal cell experiences a significant onward drawback in that light transmissivity is degraded as a result of optical absorption caused by Lien's projections. As previously discussed, Lien specifically teaches that the projections are formed of a transparent material. (See col. 5, lines 44-49). This material can be quite expensive, and would significantly increase the cost of the cell utilizing such material.

The present invention, on the other hand, realizes significant advantages over Lien because the projections of the present invention are formed on metal electrodes that are already opaque. According to this advantageous configuration, the projections may be formed of a much lower cost material than that taught by Lien. The present invention will thus also avoid the degradation of transmissivity problems of the liquid crystal display panel which would also be experienced by Lien. Accordingly, there could be no motivation to combine the three cited prior art references to reach the present invention, when the present invention experiences these significant advantages over all three cited prior art references. For these reasons as well, the Section 103 rejection of claim 1 is again traversed.

Claim 4 still stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA in view of Rieger et al. (U.S. 6,180,026). Applicants once again respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons of record, and further request that the Examiner either rebut the previously-made arguments as to the patentability of this claim, or withdraw the rejection. As previously discussed, Rieger is drawn to a twisted nematic device, and therefore specifically teaches away from the express claim language of the present invention.

Claim 5 still stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA and Rieger, and further in view of Weber et al. (U.S. 5,374,374). Applicants again respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons of record, and because claim 5 is dependent from independent claim 4, and is therefore patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to the patentability of independent claim 4.

Claim 6 of the present invention still stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA in view of Walton, Lien, and Yoshida et al. Applicants once again respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons of record, and for the reasons discussed above with the respect to the patentability of independent claim 1. Claim 6 of the present invention recites features similar to those of claim 1 which were discussed above in traversing the rejection based in part on Lien. With respect to claim 6, Lien is still the only reference cited by the Examiner for teaching projections. Yoshida neither teaches nor suggests two different projections formed on two different electrodes, that the electrode on which the projections are provided are opaque, or that the electrodes containing the projections are located outside the display area in which optical beam transmission is turned on and off.

Accordingly, for all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application, including claims 1 and 4-6, is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 

Josh C. Snider
Registration No. 47,954

Customer No. 24978
July 11, 2002
300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, IL 60606
Phone: (312) 360-0080
Fax: (312) 360-9315